UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/659,304 | 09/11/2003 | Hong Sun | 242418US2 | 3577 |

22850 7590 08/22/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| PARK, CHAN S |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2625 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/22/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/659,304 | SUN, HONG | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | CHAN S. PARK | 2625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 May 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,8-16 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2, 8-16 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 5/29/08, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1, 2, 8-16 and 19** are pending.

### *Specification*

2. The corrected or substitute specification was received on 5/29/08. The specification is acceptable.

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 2, 8-16 and 19** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim recites the limitation of a scanner being

connected to the network only through the server. Referring to fig. 7 of the Original Drawings, it appears that the scanner is connected to the server through the network 4. Also, the scanner is connected with a plurality of printers via a server and a bus bridge. The examiner finds no support in the Specification where the scanner is connected to the network 4 only through the server. Clarification/explanation from the Specification is respectfully requested.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohara U.S. Patent No. 7,136,179.

**With respect to claim 19**, Ohara discloses a scanner (scanner 2 in fig. 1) comprising:

an interface that is connected to a server (an interface for connecting scanner 2 with the printing management server 1 in fig. 1), wherein the server is connected with a network and a plurality of printers (network connecting the server and the printers in fig.

1), manages and controls the printers (col. 4, lines 57-64), and the scanner is connected to the network only through the server (fig. 1);

a scanner engine (S510 in fig. 5); and

an operation unit (col. 3, lines 59-61 & figs. 4a~4c), wherein

when in a copying mode (fig. 4A), the scanner reads image data from a document via the scanner engine by operating the operation unit alone, and supplies the image data to one of the printers via the server (fig. 5).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroshima et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,782,426 (hereinafter Kuroshima) in view of Ohara.

**With respect to claim 1**, Kuroshima discloses an image processing multifunction system (fig. 1) comprising:

a plurality of printers (fig. 1), and

a server integrated with a scanner (col. 9, lines 50-52 & col. 10, lines 48-55), wherein

the scanner is configured to acquire image data of a document (col. 10, lines 48-55).

Although it is well known in the digital image scanning/printing art to scan and transmit the scanned image data to a network printer, Kuroshima, however, does not explicitly disclose that the server is configured to send the image data acquired by the scanner to one of the printers for printing.

Ohara, the same field of endeavor of the network scanning/printing art, discloses a server that sends the scanned image data acquired by a scanner to one of the printers for printing (the printing management server 1 outputting/sending the image data to a destination printer in col. 4, liens 50-56).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the server of Kuroshima to have a function of transmitting scanned image to one of the network printers.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to print the scanned image at a remote printer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuroshima with Ohara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

**With respect to claim 2**, Kuroshima discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 1, wherein the scanner includes an operation unit having a configuration such that the scanner can be operated by operating the operation unit alone (note that a copying machine generally comprises an operation unit for operating the scanning process in col. 10, lines 48-55).

Ohara also discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 1, wherein the scanner includes an operation unit having a configuration (a touch panel in the scanner 2 in col. 5, lines 32-35) such that the scanner can be operated by operating the operation unit alone (the scanner performing the scan operation according to the instructions specified in the touch panel in col. 6, line 66 ~ col. 7, line 14).

**With respect to claim 10**, Ohara discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 1, wherein the printers have different printing performances (the printers including a color printer and high speed monochrome printer in col. 6, lines 20-25 & lines 56-62).

**With respect to claim 11**, Ohara discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 10, wherein the different printing performances include at least one of a difference in image quality, a difference in printing speed, and a difference between color printing and monochrome printing (the printers including a color printer and high speed monochrome printer in col. 6, lines 20-25 & lines 56-62).

**With respect to claim 12**, Ohara discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 1, wherein the server (printing management server 1) includes a printer selecting unit that selects a printer to which the image data is to be supplied (selecting an optimum printer among the printers specified by the operator in col. 8, lines 5-15). Again, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the server of Kuroshima to include the printer selecting unit to select an appropriate printer for printing the scanned image.

**With respect to claim 13**, Ohara discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 12, wherein the printer selecting unit selects a printer that complies with a mode set by the operation unit of the scanner (note that the printing management server 1 selects the optimum printer among the printers specified by the operator in the "Best Fit" mode in col. 5, lines 62-64 & col. 8, lines 5-15. Thus, the optimum printer complies with a mode (Best Fit mode) set by the operation unit of the scanner.)

7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kuroshima and Ohara as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of James et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,584,539 (hereinafter James).

**With respect to claim 8**, the combination discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 1, but it does not explicitly disclose that the server and the printers are connected via a bus bridge.

James, the same field of endeavor of connecting a server with printers via a network (col. 4, lines 1-13), discloses that a server and printers are connected via a bus bridge (server 102 connected to printers via bus bridge 170 in fig. 1 & col. 3, lines 52-56).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Kuroshima and Ohara to incorporate a bus bridge between the server and the printers as taught by James.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a compatible connection between the server and printers that support different kinds of bus connections (col. 5, lines 1-17 of James). It would further enable the system of Ohara to support other printers that support different bus connections.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

**With respect to claim 9**, the combination discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 1, but it does not disclose a data transmitting unit conforming a high-speed serial interface standard, wherein the data transmitting unit connects the server with the bus bridge, and the bus bridge with the printers.

James, the same field of endeavor of connecting a server with printers via a network (col. 4, lines 1-13), discloses a data transmitting unit conforming a high-speed serial interface standard (a serial interface that complies with the IEEE 1394 in col. 4, lines 101-14), wherein the data transmitting unit connects the server with the bus bridge, and the bus bridge with the printers (connecting device according to IEEE 1394 standard serial bus in fig. 1 & 21-39).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Kuroshima and Ohara to include a data transmitting unit conforming a high-speed serial interface standard to connect the server, the bus bridge and the printers as taught by James.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow high-speed/throughput communication between devices (col. 4, lines 60-67 of James).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kuroshima and Ohara as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Fujiwara et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,804,022 (hereinafter Fujiwara).

**With respect to claim 14**, the combination discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 12, but it does not explicitly disclose that the printer selecting unit selects a printer that is free.

Fujiwara, the same field of the server selecting a most appropriate printer for printing, discloses a server (server 2 in fig. 13) for selecting a printer that is free/unoccupied (server selecting the unoccupied printer in col. 13, line 63 ~ col. 14, line 7).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer selecting unit of Ohara to incorporate the method of selecting a printer that is free/unoccupied as taught by Fujiwara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a faster printing by making the printer selection based on the status report received by the server (col. 13, lines 51-62 of Fujiwara).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kuroshima and Ohara as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Yacoub U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011805.

**With respect to claim 15**, the combination discloses the image processing multifunction system according to claim 12, wherein the operator at the scanners is notified when the printing of the print job is completed (col. 8, lines 16-21 of Ohara).

The combination, however, does not explicitly disclose that the server includes a display controller that makes the operation unit of the scanner display the printer selected by the printer selecting unit.

Yacoub, the same field of endeavor of selecting the optimal printer and notifying the completion of the printing process, discloses a server selecting an optimal printer and notifying the operator of the location of the selected printer and the printed job (paragraph 31, lines 22-28).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the print completion notifying message of Ohara to include the printer location information as taught by Yacoub.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to inform the user of the printer location so that the user can pick up the printed job (paragraph 31, lines 22-28 of Yacoub).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kuroshima in view of Ohara, and further in view of Tada et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,597,783 (hereinafter Tada).

**With respect to claim 16**, Kuroshima discloses a server (scanner server in col. 9, lines 50-52) comprising:

a first interface to which a plurality of printers is connected (fig. 1);

a scanner engine configured to acquire image data of a document (col. 9, lines 50-52 & col. 10, lines 48-55);

an operation unit configured such that scanning can be conducted by operating the operation unit alone (note that a copying machine generally comprises an operation unit for operating the scanning process in col. 10, lines 48-55); wherein

the scanner is configured to acquire image data of a document (col. 10, lines 48-55).

Although it is well known in the digital image scanning/printing art to scan and transmit the scanned image data to a network printer, Kuroshima, however, does not explicitly disclose that the server is configured to send the image data acquired by the scanner to one of the printers for printing.

Ohara, the same field of endeavor of the network scanning/printing art, discloses a server that sends the scanned image data acquired by a scanner to one of the printers for printing (the printing management server 1 outputting/sending the image data to a destination printer in col. 4, liens 50-56).

Ohara also discloses the scanner which includes an operation unit having a configuration (a touch panel in the scanner 2 in col. 5, lines 32-35) such that the scanner can be operated by operating the operation unit alone (the scanner performing the scan operation according to the instructions specified in the touch panel in col. 6, line 66 ~ col. 7, line 14).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the server of Kuroshima to have a function of transmitting scanned image to one of the network printers.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to print the scanned image at a remote printer.

Note that Kuroshima discloses the server having a facsimile function which apparently needs to be connected to a facsimile network via an interface.

The combination, however, does not disclose a second interface to which a network is connected.

Tada, the same field of endeavor of a network server providing a communication link with other devices in the LAN (the CCM server 129 connected various network devices in col. 4, lines 7-10), discloses a server (CCM server 129) comprising a plurality of network interfaces (interface(s) 169, 173, 176 in fig. 2 & col. 4, lines 1-6).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the server of Kuroshima and Ohara to incorporate the plurality of network interfaces as taught by Tada.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow the server to communicate with other equipments linked to the LAN (col. 4, lines 7-10 of Tada).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

## *Conclusion*

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHAN S PARK/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Edward L. Coles/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

August 18, 2008